



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,824	02/13/2002	Kenneth Heath	RPS6043D1	1057
43971	7590	06/06/2005	EXAMINER	
CARDINAL HEALTH 7000 CARDINAL PLACE LEGAL DEPARTMENT - INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DUBLIN, OH 43017			NGUYEN, THUKHANH T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1722	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/075,824	HEATH, KENNETH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu Khanh T. Nguyen	1722	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 10 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 10 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

ve

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 discloses a step of embossing and blister formation of the film being done within a single pass of pin advancement. A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In *Ex parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10 and 12 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeiter et al (6,269,671) in view of Hoffman (3,685,338).

Zeiter et al disclose a method and apparatus for forming shaped packaging, comprising a pin (6) having a body and a face portion, which has at least two contiguous frusto-conical portions (Fig. 10, a, b, c) having different apex angles (Fig. 10, x, y, z); a platen (8) bearing an

indicia forming die (col. 5, lines 7-12) and means for advancing the pin toward the platen (col. 8, lines 61-67); wherein the pin body and the pin face comprises different materials having different friction parameters (col. 5, lines 26-60).

Zeiter et al fail to disclose that the pin having a concave surface having a peripheral edge and indicia thereon.

Hoffman discloses a web forming apparatus, comprising an upper and lower forming stamp (26, 50) having complement concave surfaces, a peripheral edge and a plurality of indication or corrugations (26a, 50a) on the forming surfaces (Fig. 1, 26, 50) for forming a product from a web having a particular shape.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify Zeiter et al by providing the pin surface having a concave surface, a peripheral edge, and a plurality of indications on the forming surface as taught by Hoffman in order to form a product having a concave surface and an embossing pattern on the surface.

The step of embossing and blister formation are done in a single pass of pin advancement onto the film is a functional limitation, which could be inherent from the apparatus structure and cannot be used to determine the patentability of an apparatus claim. It has been held that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty may, in fact, be an inherent characteristic of the prior art. The applicants is required to prove that the subject matter shown in the prior art does not necessarily possess the characteristics relied on. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F. 3d 1473, 1478, 44 USPQ 2d, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1997); See also, *In re Spada*, 911 F 2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1977); *In re Best*, 562 F. 2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); and *Ex Parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922, 1925 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed February 24, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
6. In response to applicant's argument that Hoffman is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Hoffman relates to a metal stamping and drawing apparatus forming different objects from sheet metal blanks, while Zeiter discloses a stamping tool for shaping blister packs from thermoplastic or metal plastic laminate films (col. 1, lines 5-19). Because Zeiter recognizes that the same stamping apparatus could be used for drawing thermoplastic or metal foils, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to improve Zeiter by applying the teaching of Hoffman.

In regard to the method of embossing and forming blister in a single pass of pin advancement onto the film, it has been held that functional limitation has little or no patentable weight in an apparatus claim. It has been held that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty may, in fact, be an inherent characteristic of the prior art. The applicants is required to prove that the subject matter shown in the prior art does not necessarily possess the characteristics relied on. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F. 3d 1473, 1478, 44 USPQ 2d, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1997); See also, *In re Spada*, 911 F 2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1977); *In re Best*, 562 F. 2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); and *Ex Parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922, 1925 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989).

Conclusion

7. This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/075,824. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Khanh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1136. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin L. Utech can be reached on 571-272-1137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TN


ROBERT DAVIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300 1722

6/01/05